

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

All of the pending claims, claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the Examiner alleges that the term "limited printing out" is indefinite.

The Examiner further alleges that there is "insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation". However, this remark is not understood. If the rejection is more than the term "limited printing out " is indefinite, the Examiner is respectfully urged to clarify the rejection.

With regard to the allegation that the meaning of "limited printing out" is indefinite, the Examiner is advised that the meaning of "limited printing out" is clearly disclosed in the specification beginning at page 23, line 13. As clearly explained in the specification, the system is able to impose limitations on the ability of a user to print using the system. As also clearly set forth in the specification, there are different types of limitations that may be imposed. For example, according to the embodiment set forth on page 23, line 16, if there are insufficient advertisers to subsidize the cost of the printing, free printing may be inhibited. In such a case, the user can print only by paying a fee. The fee may either involve a full fee for a print free of advertising or it may be a reduced fee for a print having a reduced number of advertisements printed thereon.

In a second embodiment, limitations may be imposed as to the number of prints that a user could make in order to prevent a user from printing out too many

prints in bad faith. See, e.g., the embodiment disclosed beginning at page 24, line 18.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the specification clearly identifies what is meant by "limitation" or the "limited printing out" in the claims.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing remarks, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that the Examiner requires further information concerning this issue, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney to initiate an interview with the Examiner in order to expedite prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: 11-10-04

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620